

Applicant: EBERLE *et al.*
Serial No: 09/661,189
Filing Date: September 13, 2000
Page: 7 of 9

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed November 10, 2005 (hereinafter "Final Action"), claims 1, 5-6, 9, 11, 15-16, and 19 have been amended. No claims have been cancelled or newly added. Therefore, claims 1-20 remain pending. Support for the instant amendments is provided throughout the as-filed Specification. Thus, no new matter has been added. In view of the foregoing amendments and following comments, allowance of all the claims pending in the application is respectfully requested.

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

A. Applicants are submitting on even date two *electronic* Information Disclosure Statements and respectfully request that the Examiner consider the cited references and provide signed copies of the PTO-1449 Forms for these submissions with the next Office Action.

B. Applicants are submitting herewith a Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement and respectfully request that the Examiner consider the cited references and provide a signed copy of the Form PTO-1449 for this submission with the next Office Action.

COMMENT ON RELATED APPLICATION

In the "Response to Final Office Action" submitted in the above-captioned case on June 3, 2004, Applicants argued that the reference entitled Synthetic News Radio, IBM Systems Journal, VOL. 39, Nos. 3 & 4, April 2000, pages 646-659 to Emnet *et al.* (hereinafter "Emnet I") did not qualify as prior art. See 06/03/2004 Response, at pg. 7. Applicants still maintain this position. However, pursuant to the duty of disclosure,

Applicant: EBERLE *et al.*
Serial No: 09/661,189
Filing Date: September 13, 2000
Page: 8 of 9

Applicants wish to bring to the Examiner's attention a reference entitled: Synthetic Audio Newscast, The MIT Media Laboratory, pgs.1-2, to Emnett *et al.* (hereinafter "Emnett II"), having an "*alleged*" December, 1998 publication date.

This reference, Emnet II, is being cited in the Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement submitted herewith. See Form PTO-1449, pg. 1 of 2, item 1H. Applicants became aware of this reference through its citation by an Examiner in co-pending U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/460,708, which is also assigned to MicroStrategy, the assignee of the above-referenced application. Applicants disagree with the alleged claim rejections over Emnett II in co-pending application 09/460,708 for many reasons, one of which is because the Emnett II reference has no clear publication date indicated thereon. Regardless, Applicants are making Emnet II of record in this case pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.56.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,721,827 to Logan *et al.* ("Logan") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,157,705 to Perrone, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,652,789 to Miner *et al.* ("Miner"). See Final Action, pg. 2, ¶2.

Applicants disagree with the propriety of the rejection. However, solely in an effort to expedite prosecution, independent claims 1 and 11 have been amended to clarify one or more points of novelty over the references of record. In particular, claims 1 and 11 each recite, *inter alia*, the features of generating at least one personalized report for a voice service subscriber...wherein the at least one personalized report includes content derived from an on-line analytical processing (OLAP) system. Independent claims 1 and 11 further recite

Applicant: EBERLE *et al.*
Serial No: 09/661,189
Filing Date: September 13, 2000
Page: 9 of 9

initiating an outbound communication to the voice service subscriber to commence an interactive voice broadcast with the voice service subscriber, during which content from the at least one personalized report is presented to the voice service subscriber. Neither Logan, Perrone, nor Miner, viewed either alone or in combination, disclose, teach, or suggest *at least* these features. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 1 and 11 is earnestly sought. Dependent claims 2-10 and 12-20 are allowable because they depend from allowable independent claims, as well as for the further features they contain.

CONCLUSION


Having addressed each of the foregoing rejections, it is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Date: February 9, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____


Bradford C. Blaise
Registration No. 47,429

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP
P.O. Box 10500
McLean, Virginia 22102
Direct Dial: 703-770-7741
Main: 703-770-7900
Fax: 703-770-7901